

## REMARKS

### **Specification**

1. The abstract of the disclosure currently stands objected to because the abstract only sets forth benefits of the article and not structure of the article itself as required.

Please note that an amended version of the abstract of the disclosure, believed to comply with MPEP 608.01(b), has been included with this office action response. Please see "Specification Amendments."

### **Claim Rejections; 35 USC 112**

2. Claim 2 currently stands rejected under 35 USC 112 as there is insufficient antecedent basis for "said extended portion" in the claims.

Please note that claim 2 has been amended so "extended" has been replaced with "exterior," for which there is sufficient antecedent basis in the claims. See "Claim Amendments."

3. Claim 3 currently stands rejected under 35 USC 112 as there is insufficient antecedent basis for "said transition portion" in the claims.

Please note that claim 2 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for "said transition portion" in claim 3. See "Claim Amendments."

### **Double Patenting**

4. Claim 1 currently stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,659,134.

Applicant now files a divisional application containing only claim 1, for which Applicant now files a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Applicant now cancels claim 1 from the current application. However, claims 2 and 3 are amended and kept in the present application, for which Applicant does not file a terminal disclaimer.

## DRAWING AMENDMENTS